

Making English Their Own: The Use of ELF among Students of English at the FUB

Elizabeth J. Erling, Freie Universität Berlin

Tom Bartlett, University of Northern Virginia

Abstract. This paper analyses the attitudes and motives of students studying English at the Freie Universität Berlin (FUB) and suggests that changing opinions on national (US and UK) standards and the emergence of the ‘New Europe’ represent mutually reinforcing conditions of possibility for the deliberate adoption of a Europeanised English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). We present results from a sociolinguistic profile of students at the FUB which include a statistical analysis of questionnaires distributed to 101 students of English in July 2001; excerpts from student essays that reflect on the role of English in students’ lives; and in-depth interviews with five of these students (see further Erling 2004). Through statistical analysis, it became clear that there were certain clusters among students: a US-friendly cluster (54%), a pro-British cluster (13%) and a lingua franca cluster (34%). In this paper, the lingua franca cluster is considered in depth with an analysis of their descriptions of the challenges of making English ‘their own [...] forcing it to submit to their own intentions and accents’ (Bakhtin 1981: 294). We also describe specific linguistic features of these students’ Englishes and compare them to other varieties of world Englishes. These findings suggest that these users are appropriating the language for their own purposes, asserting their identities through English and empowering themselves as owners of the language. With this in mind, pedagogical implications for teaching ELF at the university level are considered in the final section of the paper.

1. Introduction

Part of the process of European unification and the construction of a new European identity has included establishing a European area of higher education. In an effort to reform the structures of higher education

systems in a convergent way, the Bologna Declaration was drawn up and signed by 29 countries in 1999, with reforms to be completed by 2010. The Declaration was designed to enhance the employability and mobility of citizens and to increase the international competitiveness of higher education, as many European universities face challenges related to the employability of graduates, the shortage of skills in key areas, and the expansion of transnational education (*Bologna Declaration* 1999). Part of these reforms entail the standardisation of a two-tier Bachelor/Master's degree format and the restructuring of degree programmes to make them more practical and sensitive to the economic needs of European countries. In Germany, the implementation of the European measures is also seen as addressing basic national interests, and particular emphasis has been placed on the concept of internationalisation (cf. Erling and Hilgendorf 2006). The Freie Universität Berlin (FUB)¹, one of the country's largest and most prestigious universities, has assumed a pioneering role in German university reforms and, because of its dedication to internationalisation, is one of ten universities most likely to receive national funding to establish a so-called 'elite university' ("The Freie Universität Today" 2006; "Initiative for Excellence Competition" 2006). Part of making the university more sensitive to global demands has included the introduction of language courses, particularly for non-specialists, and existing language courses have been restructured with the intention of serving students' future needs in the employment sector (Mackiewicz 2005).

In light of European integration and the ensuing reforms, this paper will describe a research project designed to gauge the attitudes and motives of students studying English at the FUB and make university courses more sensitive to their needs. At the start of this research project, it was expected that some students would resent the presence of English in their lives and be worried about linguistic imperialism (Phillipson 1992) and the dominance of English in Europe, for example in the domain of academic publishing (Ammon 2001). This was especially

¹ Free University of Berlin.

thought to be the case since fears for the German language in the face of English and the increasing Europeanisation and Americanisation of German culture are often expressed in the national media (Erling 2006). But since student opinions toward English were generally positive, even while they expressed complex attitudes towards national standards and the US and UK in general, this examination attempts to understand how students resist the dominance of English or legitimise their nonnative voices in global and European domains of lingua franca communication. Through statistical analysis of the students' responses it became clear that there were certain clusters among students: a US-friendly cluster (54%), a pro-British cluster (13%) and a lingua franca cluster (34%) (Erling 2004). In the following sections we focus on this innovative lingua franca cluster and consider their descriptions of the challenges of making English 'their own [...] forcing it to submit to their own intentions and accents' (Bakhtin 1981: 294). We then suggest that changing opinions on national (US and UK) standards and the emergence of the 'New Europe' represent mutually reinforcing conditions of possibility for the deliberate adoption of a Europeanised English as a lingua franca (ELF).

After presenting the context and background of this study, this paper will describe some of the linguistic features that are characteristic of these students' Englishes, which are also compared to features of other varieties of English that have been established by Durham (2003), Jenkins (2000), Melchers and Shaw (2003), Seidlhofer (2001b), and Trudgill and Hannah (1985), among others. The variations discussed here further confirm that these users are making English their own, i.e. appropriating the language for their own purposes, asserting their identities through English and empowering themselves as rightful owners of the language. With this in mind, pedagogical implications for teaching ELF at the university level are considered in the final section of the paper. These include teaching critical language awareness, moving away from teaching languages as purely national constructs, and employing an intercultural approach.

2. The context: The Freie Universität Berlin (FUB)

The FUB is one of three major universities in Berlin, with approximately 35,000 students. Its history and connections make it a particularly interesting environment to examine in terms of the use of English among university students. The FUB is a by-product of the division of the city after World War II. Following the war, Berlin's major university at the time was located in the Soviet Sector, and, as a result of battles between the Soviet Union and the Western Allies over the availability of knowledge in Berlin, a new university was founded in the west in 1948—a 'free' university—with generous support from the US ("A Rich Tradition" 2006). The FUB, which was located in the American Sector, has always had strong ties with the US. Consequently, it has been home to one of the best departments for North American Studies in Germany, founded in 1963. In addition to this department, the university also has a Department of English Studies, which focuses on the study of the languages, literatures and cultures of the English-speaking world other than North America. This department also offers English Language Pedagogy programmes and manages the training of future teachers. All of these study programmes require students to take technical language courses at the university's language centre, where one of the authors of this paper has been employed since 1998. For these reasons, the language centre was the most convenient place to access students of English in all three programmes.

3. The study: A sociolinguistic profile of students of English at the FUB

The language centre provided the focus of a 'sociolinguistic profile' of students of English in the programmes for English Philology, North American Studies, and English Language Pedagogy at the FUB. This type of analysis, originally outlined by Ferguson (1975), has been used in sociolinguistics to represent situations where English is used around the world (see Kachru and Nelson 1996). A sociolinguistic profile both highlights the salient uses and users of a language and reveals attitudes to a language in a particular context. It provides information about the

functions English serves in a local context and how it fits into speakers' overall linguistic repertoires.

This profile takes into account a statistical analysis of questionnaires distributed to 101 students in language centre courses for English in July 2001 (see further Erling 2004 and Erling 2005). There were approximately 200 students enrolled in English courses at that time, so around half of them responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire surveyed students' experiences with learning English, their exposure to the language, and their attitudes towards it and its speakers.² It contained 64 questions, with mostly forced choice responses. There were a few questions left open-ended in order to solicit longer explanations and answers.

After analyzing the data collected from the questionnaires, it became clear that there were certain patterns in students' answers. In order to find out more about these patterns, a Ward cluster analysis was carried out. This is an exploratory statistical technique used to sort cases into groups or clusters so that the degree of association between members of the same cluster can be brought out (Kaufman and Rousseeuw 1990). Once the clusters were established, five students were interviewed: two from the larger clusters (1 & 3) and one from the smaller cluster (2).

The interview questions were designed to test hypothesised categories and to give more insight into the quantitative results already established. Rather than sticking to a rigid format, the interviews were loosely organised, using what Schiffrin (1994) calls a 'stepwise format', in which the next discussion topic was based on the respondent's previous answer. In this way, the interview resembled a conversation,

² An important source for the questionnaire was a study administered by Bent Preisler (1999), who undertook a comprehensive assessment of the role of English in Denmark. Many thanks to him for supplying a copy of the questionnaire, to Matthias Boenner for translating it from Danish to English and to Bertil Schwötzer and Jens Vogelgesang for assisting with the analysis of the empirical data. Thanks also to all students at the language centre who volunteered their insights and opinions for this project, particularly the interviewees. All participants in this study remain anonymous, and the names of the interviewees have been replaced with pseudonyms.

and students revealed personal accounts of their experiences with the language.

In addition to data from questionnaires and interviews, this study includes data collected from student essays and assignments given in courses between July 2001 and April 2004. These excerpts are from tasks which required students to reflect on the role of English in their life, in Europe or as a global lingua franca. While some of these texts may have been written by students who completed the questionnaire, this is not always the case. All excerpts are cited with the informed consent of the student authors. The texts are also cited verbatim, in their uncorrected original form. These excerpts are marked in this text with bullet points (•).

3.1. The presence of English in students' lives

The most outstanding features of the student responses are that the English language plays a significant role in students' lives and that they are extremely proficient in the language by the time they get to university, with the majority (53%) already having had between 8-10 years of English education. Perhaps unsurprisingly, English plays an important role in their lives both inside and outside the classroom: 80% of students read English reference books at least once a week (18% daily), and 70% of students read in English for pleasure at least once a week (18% daily). Many students also use English at work: 60% of the 74% of students who work outside of university meet English at work at least once a week, and, irrespective of their career preference, almost all students (97%) expect to need English for their professional careers. Moreover, 63% of students said that they had a free time activity (besides reading) for which English is used. These include acting in an English drama group, writing songs or poetry in English, listening to music, watching films or television, keeping up with the news, and surfing the internet.

Furthermore, students regularly communicate outside their local or national context and use the vehicle of English to access the global community. They go abroad regularly and use English in that context: 92% of students travel outside Germany at least once a year. Moreover, 97% of students have travelled to an English speaking country, and 59%

of students have stayed in an English-speaking country for over a month. Although students are generally well travelled, they do not have to go abroad to speak English, as English is often seen as the language of the younger generation and they encounter it so regularly that many consider it an established feature of their lives in Berlin. The extensive use of English that FUB students experience mirrors the general tendency for English use in institutions of the European Union, where interaction between speakers from a variety of language backgrounds results in increasing use of English as a lingua franca (cf. Wright 2000).

3.2. The use of ELF among FUB students

As stated above, the cluster analysis of student responses revealed a rather large group of 34% of students who do not affiliate themselves with either the US or the UK and who do not necessarily orient themselves towards dominant L1 norms in spoken language or necessarily seek to recreate for themselves either UK or US identities. For this reason, they were labelled the lingua franca cluster. A lingua franca is defined by McArthur (2002: 605-606) as ‘a language common to, or shared by, many cultures and communities at any or all social and educational levels, and used as an international tool.’ Modiano (2001: 170) adds that a lingua franca is ‘a mode of communication which allows people to interact with others without aligning themselves to ideological positioning indicative of a specific mother-tongue speech community.’ Students in this cluster fulfil both these aspects of the definition. That they aim to communicate as part of a global community can be seen in the following student’s observation:

- I think English is playing a rather important role in my life. If you turn on the radio, most of the songs are in English. If you turn on the computer or surf on the internet, you need to understand English. At university there are a lot of exchange students from foreign countries and you communicate with them in English. I’m surrounded by English all the time. We have to admit that we adopted quite a lot of English expressions in German and therefore, without really recognizing it, English plays a major role in our society. Almost everybody has learned English at school (of the younger generation) and it really became a kind of second language in Germany.

16 Erling and Bartlett

Moreover, as in Modiano's definition, these students do not necessarily identify with English-speaking countries. Such students, as the next generation of professionals in the European marketplace often seek to create 'imagined communities' (Anderson 1991) which are more democratic or flexible within the new international 'linguistic marketplace' (Bourdieu 1991), as demonstrated in the remarks of two students:

- In a world of internationalization and globalization, would it make sense to learn a culturally restricted variety?
- There should be an international language which doesn't depend on a special country/tradition.

These students state that they do not aim to acquire a particular native model of English but rather 'good' English, or a mixture of varieties depending on the context. This, they feel, will allow them to communicate in all English-speaking environments. These students express no strong feeling of connection to either the US or the UK, and 68% of this cluster agree with the statement 'English is a tool for communication and I don't identify with any English-speaking culture.' They are not particularly interested in either British or American culture and history but view English as a tool and a link to the global community, a means to communicate internationally. This attitude is clearly expressed in the following student's statement:

- I don't care about what Clinton does in his private life [...] and I don't really care about England. I suppose I study English because it's become the Latin of the 20th century.

One representative of the lingua franca cluster interviewed is Oskar, whose model of English is what he calls 'the best English possible.' For him, English is a means of communication, and he is not interested in having a native-like accent or identifying with an English-speaking culture. As he said in an interview, 'I'm not from an English-speaking country, so why should I?' He reports that when he is speaking English he does not purposely try to show that he is from Germany, but that he does not try to hide this either.

The fact that many students, like Oskar, do not orient themselves towards a 'native' variety of English is further demonstrated by their responses to the question of whether they feel it is more advantageous to

have a 'native-like accent of one variety of English' or 'a neutral variety of English that does not represent one culture or country.' Here, 39% feel that it is better to have a neutral variety that does not represent one culture or country. Some of these students consider neutral English to be more 'open' or 'flexible' and one student finds that this neutrality allows a speaker to have 'higher potential of communication in every English-speaking part of the world.' As one student noted, 'There would be less problems understanding each other.' And not only do these students consider that 'neutral' English is easier to understand for everyone, but they also claim that it is easier to learn. As one student remarked, 'It's hard to achieve a native-like accent of one variety.'

Seidlhofer (2001a: 141) recognises that there are English speakers who are 'not primarily concerned with emulating the way native speakers use their mother tongue within their own communities [...] instead, the central concerns for this domain are efficiency, relevance and economy in language learning and language use.' She thus promotes the teaching of a type of English that is not based on any particular national linguistic standard. She and others, like Jenkins and Modiano, argue that this form of English will better prepare learners to communicate with L2 English speakers from all over the world and will be more open to the different cultural backgrounds of the interlocutors.

However, while these views suggest an attitude of either pragmatism or liberalism as the main motivation for adopting an EFL variety, others point to a more deliberate adoption of a multiculturalist stance where nuances are important vectors of identity and difference is valued. Many of those who prefer to speak a 'neutral variety of English' remarked that it is preferable to speak a variety that they consider more democratic, offering opportunities for everyone in the world to communicate on equal grounds. For these students developing a neutral variety of English shows just as much concern with authenticity as for those who prefer a native variety, as they feel that they cannot and do not want to escape their identity as L2 or ELF speakers:

- If you're not a native speaker, you shouldn't try to sound like one.
- If you have a native like accent you might be mistaken for somebody you aren't.
- It might be possible to bring nuances of meaning from your native language across and you don't sound phony.

As this last quote brings out, these students believe they can assert their authority over the language by incorporating their local identity into English—or by creating a new identity. They refuse to hide or be ashamed of their nonnative accents, legitimising their identities as new speakers of English within the new linguistic marketplace provided by globalisation in general and pan-Europeanism in particular. Thus, as Smith (1976: 5) suggested more than thirty years ago, not only does the learning of English not necessarily imply the adoption of English-speaking cultures, but it also allows for other cultures to communicate to the rest of the world their identity, culture, politics, religion and way of life. These students see English as a means to participate in the world community on their own terms.

4. Linguistic features of FUB students' Englishes

So far, this paper has argued that English no longer functions solely as a foreign language among students of English at the FUB and has shown how several of them assert the right to appropriate the language to suit their purposes. These findings support the suggestions of scholars like Modiano (2000), Jenkins (2000) and Seidlhofer (2001a), who propose the acceptance of a European variety of English that follows its own norms and not those of British or American L1 speakers. Similarly, Berns (1995) argues that a European variety of English would allow European speakers of English to distinguish themselves from speakers of other varieties. In these terms the *lingua franca* stance is not as neutral as some of the student respondents suggest but carries its own ideological statement, a point we shall follow up below. But before discussing the ideological implications of legitimising this local variety, we describe the more stable linguistic features that distinguish this variety and its speakers. More specifically, we provide a brief sketch of forms that students of English at the FUB often produce and which might be evidence that a variety of German English is developing as a distinct variety of ELF. The description includes a description of distinctive phonological, lexicogrammatical and discursive features of English that appear in the German university classroom. Apart from the description of phonological features, which has been formed on the basis of the student

interviews, the examples below have been taken from students' written assignments.

Of course this is an impressionistic account based on a specific community of speakers and the examples given are taken out of context. Ideally, this study would be backed up by more detailed corpus work. Since this has not (yet) been possible, each feature of these students' uses of English will be compared to results of other studies, for example Durham's (2003) corpus findings on Pan Swiss English (PSE) and Seidlhofer's (2001a) preliminary corpus findings on ELF. Features of FUB students' Englishes are also compared to features of other varieties of world Englishes, where variations in indigenised forms are often explained in terms of interference from the L1 (Bamgbose 1982). Indeed several of the following examples show that students' Englishes are influenced by their L1, which in the majority of cases is German. However, many of these features also appear in other varieties of English, which the questionnaire shows students at the FUB regularly come into contact with: while the most common experiences students reported were studying or working abroad in 'inner circle' English-speaking environments, to use Kachru's (1985) terminology, a small number of students have had experiences in 'outer circle' contexts and many reported that they regularly used English in 'expanding circle' contexts.

Consequently, it may be that when students encounter varieties of world Englishes, stable, 'non-standard' features of these varieties reinforce local features. Here the variation may not only be a feature of German English, but perhaps even a global variety of ELF. Crystal (1995: 362) notes that there are

certain idiosyncrasies in English, as in any language, which are likely to pose particular difficulty to learners, wherever it is taught. And it is perfectly possible that some of these difficulties could become institutionalized into local norms in more or less the same way. If so, then what we may eventually need to recognize is a super-supranational concept of World Second Language English, with regional variation arising chiefly from its contact with different native languages and cultures [...].

With this in mind, the similarities among students' Englishes and other world English varieties lend strength to the idea that certain features of lingua franca communication are becoming stabilised. Therefore, what we may be seeing is a process by which ELF is distinguished from L1

varieties at the global level yet itself includes localised varieties which thus simultaneously mark a global and a local identity.

4.1. Phonological features

The most obvious feature of these students' English pronunciation is a mixture that results from the numerous varieties of English that they have contact with. Melchers and Shaw (2003: 187) describe this variety of European English as a mixture of British-type and US-type pronunciations, with its main phonological characteristics deriving from the speaker's mother tongue. This description of English pronunciation well suits the varieties one can hear at the FUB, where many students describe their English as an American-British-German mix.

One of the most characteristic features of German pronunciation in English is the confusion of the consonants /v/ and /w/ (Swan and Smith 1987: 32), where the word *village* [vɪlɪdʒ] is realised as /wɪlɪtʃ/. Furthermore, because the sounds /ʃ/ and /ʒ/ do not exist in German (Swan and Smith 1987: 32), they are often realised as /s/ and /z/ or /d/ and /t/. For example, the word *youth* [juːθ] is realised as /juːs/—which is also the case in Singapore English (Mei 2001)—and the word *then* [θen] is realised as /den/—which is also found in Malaysian English (Preshous 2001). According to Jenkins (2000), who has established the core features of ELF communication, most consonant sounds are essential features of English pronunciation. This means that the distinction between /v/ and /w/ must be mastered by German learners who want to achieve international comprehensibility. However in Jenkins' model, /ʃ/ and /ʒ/ are not core sounds, which means that the inability to pronounce them does not lead to miscommunication. Moreover, these sounds are acknowledged as being exceptionally difficult to learn (Jenkins 1998: 122) because they do not occur in the majority of the world's languages or even in some native English varieties (e.g. Irish English, Crystal 1995: 337). Thus, such features are likely to become stable in EFL communication.

Jenkins (2002: 96) further argues that a requirement of successful ELF pronunciation includes the shortening of vowel sounds before voiceless consonants and maintenance of a length distinction before

voiced consonants. The lack of differentiation between long and short vowels results in a devoicing of the following consonant, which can result in incomprehensibility, for example when the word *food* is realised as /fʊt/. Although this is a common feature of German pronunciation in English, it is not likely to become a feature of ELF communication because it impedes communication. However, there is one area of German pronunciation where devoicing occurs so regularly that this feature is becoming regularised. In the pronunciation of the word *live* [laɪv]—which has become a German word—the /v/ is often devoiced, so that *live* is realised as /laɪf/. This feature of pronunciation has resulted in the word being spelled *life*, for example in places that advertise *Life Music* or *Life Sex Shows*. In fact, there is a German radio station called *MDR Life*, where the context suggests that the intended meaning is *Live*.

Another feature of German pronunciation is differentiation in stress patterns in certain words or phrases. For example, when students hear the word *Berlin* pronounced in a phrase like *Berlin Wall* [bɛrːlɪn wɔːl], they may assume that the stress in the word is always on the first syllable. They then produce phrases like *the city of Berlin* [bɛrːlɪn], placing the stress on the first part of the word (most L1 speakers of English would pronounce this phrase as *the city of Berlin* [bɛrːlɪn]). Moreover, German compound expressions are generally stressed on the first element, so English compounds like *front door*, where the second element is stressed, may be mispronounced (Swan and Smith 1987: 32). However, Jenkins (1998: 123) argues that different stress patterns do not seem to create a barrier to comprehensibility, and since rules for word stress are highly complex, containing many exceptions and differences among L1 varieties and according to the context, '[r]eliable rules therefore cannot be easily formulated, let alone learnt.' Thus differentiation in stress patterns may be becoming an acceptable feature of ELF.

Clear word boundaries, some marked with glottal stops, are a feature of the pronunciation of German. Moreover, German, unlike English, has few weak forms. When these features are transferred to English, they can create 'a very foreign-sounding staccato effect,' according to Swan and Smith (1987: 33). For example, in L1 English the phrase *a friend of ours* is often realised as [ə frend_ɪv_aʊz].

However, in German English, it may be realised as [f **frent** f a z]. While an L1 speaker of English may link the final consonant of a word to the initial vowel of the following word, a German speaker of English may retain the distinction between each individual word. Jenkins (1998: 123) shows that word linking and weak forms are areas open to variation and unlikely to result in misunderstanding so that their absence, like differences in stress patterns, may become an accepted feature of ELF pronunciation.

4.2. Lexicogrammatical features

As with phonological differences, there are several lexicogrammatical features of the English of students at the FUB which occur frequently and are also found in other varieties of English. Such divergences from standard written English have been attributed to interference from the L1, which has a set of rules that are in conflict with those of English that the learner of English frequently falls back upon (Jibril 1982: 82; Swan and Smith 1987). However, many of these variations also occur in other varieties of English. As has been shown, the average student of English at the FUB is well travelled and uses ELF in many contexts, so their production of these forms could also result from contact with different varieties of world English as well as other lingua franca speakers. Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that these features could be regularised in a form of ELF. These lexicogrammatical features will be explained below, compared with other varieties of world Englishes, and demonstrated with examples from texts written by students of English at the FUB.

4.2.1. Article use

In the German use of English, there is an occasional loss of distinction between count and noncount nouns, as is also the case in several other varieties of world Englishes. In some cases, nouns that are noncount in standard English and need a metaphorical unit if they are to be singularised, such as (*piece of*) *information*, simply take an indefinite article. Kachru (1982) shows that this feature is a feature of South Asian English, while Trudgill and Hannah (1985: 104) demonstrate that it also

occurs in West African Englishes. The following examples show variation in count and noncount nouns in the texts of students of English at the FUB:

- She gave me *an* advice that I'll never forget.
- This is *a* proof that the situation is getting worse.
- I have to complete *a* research.

In addition, noncount nouns are often directly pluralised as count nouns, as is the case with Hong Kong English (Pennycook 2001: 208) and in West African English (Trudgill and Hannah 1985: 104). Examples are:

- There are a lot more *vocabularies* that I understand.
- I hope we don't have a lot of *homeworks* this semester.

Further article variation includes the definite article being used more often than in standard written English. Studies on Indian English (McArthur 2002: 323), PSE (Durham 2003), and ELF (Seidlhofer 2001b: 212) have found a similar tendency. Examples of the extended use of the definite article include:

- With news of the 49er's success making headlines, *the* gold fever had begun.
- It is *the* nature's way.

4.2.2. Time, tense and aspect

There are several variations in the use of tense and aspect in the English of students at the FUB. One common variation in tense is the use of the present instead of the present perfect with phrases indicating a period continuing from past to present. Confusion of the time expressions *for* and *since* can also be found. The use of present tense for present perfect meaning also occurs in Indian English (Trudgill and Hannah 1985: 109) as well as Gaelic English (McArthur 2002: 95). Student examples include:

- I *am* here *since* two o'clock.
- I *'m* a student for ten years now.

24 Erling and Bartlett

The second type of variation includes the use of the present perfect instead of the simple past, especially with past time adverbs. This use is also found in Indian English (Trudgill and Hannah 1985: 110) and Filipino English (McArthur 2002: 346). Student examples include:

- I *have been* there ten years ago.
- I *have seen* her yesterday.

The third feature of verb use commonly found in German English is a wider use of the progressive aspect or the use of the progressive with stative verbs. The progressive also has a wider use in Irish English (Crystal 1995: 338), South Asian English (Kachru 1982), and West African Englishes (Trudgill and Hannah 1985: 104). Furthermore, Axelsson and Hahn (2001: 26) suggest that young European users of English may be influenced by new or extended uses of the progressive as a general increase in its use has been seen over the last thirty years. This tendency is particularly obvious in verbs that sometimes have a dynamic meaning (e.g. *like*, *have*). Examples of the wider use of progressive aspect include:

- She *is looking* like her mother.
- Mark *is having* many books.

4.2.3 Expressing condition

Extended use of the modal verb *would* for expressing condition also occurs in German English, as well as in other varieties. In German, the auxiliary which corresponds roughly to *would* (*würde*) may be used in both the main clause and the *if*-clause. Thus, German students are often taught that in English *if and would are never good* (cf. Grau 2005: 269). However, Trudgill and Hannah (1985: 49) note that in many dialects of US English, *would* can be used in the *if*-clause. Thus there is some evidence that the rule for expressing condition may be changing. Examples from FUB students include:

- I know that even if I *would* practice the rest of my life, I would never be good enough.
- If I *would* have seen you, I would have said hello.

4.2.4. Adverbs

In German English, there are also variations in adverb use, particularly with adjectival forms of a word being used instead of adverbs. This can be attributed to the fact that some German adjectives and adverbs have the same form (e.g. *gut* = *good* and *well*). But sentences such as *the film was real interesting* and *the car runs good* can be heard in varieties of US English (Trudgill and Hannah 1985: 65), and Crystal (1995: 327) notes that the *-ly* adverbial ending is often dropped in Estuary English. These factors combined might contribute to a general disappearance of the adjective/adverb distinction in ELF communication. Examples include:

- But they all speak real *good*.
- If I was trying to talk really *personal*, then it's easier for me in German.

Another feature of adverb use in the English of students at the FUB is the variation of its placement, which was also found in PSE (Durham 2003), as in:

- Instead of enquiring *critically* his standpoint [...]
- *Always* if I write I have to think in German.
- I did *already* a little bit, but that's not going to be enough.

4.2.5. Prepositions

There is also variation of preposition use in the English of students at the FUB. Swan and Smith (1987: 38) suggest that this may arise in cases where 'an English expression is not constructed with the "same" preposition as is used in German' or when a German preposition has more than one regular English equivalent. Preposition variation can also be found in other varieties of English: Crystal (1995: 360) notes variation in expressions like *discuss about* and *pay attention on* in South Asian English, while Melchers and Shaw (2003: 188) and Alexander (1999: 27) have mentioned similar preposition variation in the use of ELF. Furthermore, Durham (2003) has found that preposition use in PSE

26 Erling and Bartlett

includes a wider use of *to*, missing or unnecessary prepositions, or the use of the ‘wrong’ prepositions. Confusion about prepositions may be compounded by the fact that usage is often different even within standard American and British English (McArthur 2002: 253). Examples of variation in preposition use include:

- He is allergic *against* penicillin.
- This is only one example *for* the ways in which literature has a part in creating new social reality.
- They do not know how to react *on* the situation.
- It’s doing something *on* your personality.
- I have to turn in the application *until* [=by] Friday. (This example could also result from variation in word order, i.e. I have *until Friday* to turn in the application.)

Moreover, in some cases, the preposition commonly found in standard English is left out. This also occurs in South Asian English (Crystal 1995: 360) and PSE (Durham 2003). Examples include:

- He attracted many young African Americans who searched ____ an alternative to the patient attempt to integrate them.
- Can you explain ____ me why this is so?
- I highly recommend ____ you the one [...]

4.2.6. Extensions and transfers

There are other lexical innovations that may be classified as extensions of German words or transfers from German into English. For example, one can often find a loss of the distinction between word pairs that have similar yet distinct meanings in most L1 varieties of English. These include word pairs like *make/do*, *listen/hear*, *speak/talk*, *study/learn* and *borrow/lend*. While some of these features may be particular to German speakers of English, the loss of distinction between some of these words, like *hear/listen* and *borrow/lend*, can also be found in other varieties, such as Malaysian English (Preshous 2001). Examples from students of the FUB include:

- You can *make* a three semester course.
- The mistakes I *do*, [...] they are German mistakes.
- If I am *hearing* German news [...]

- Last night he stayed in *learning* for an exam.
- I asked if he could *borrow* me that book.

4.3. Discursive features in academic writing

Beyond distinctive phonological and lexicogrammatical features of students' Englishes, there are also discursive features of academic texts that commonly occur and which may be an evolving form of a German dialect of ELF. Clyne (1987b: 233) finds that 'English texts by German scholars tend to contain the same cultural discourse patterns as German texts'. Thus, as increasingly more English texts are being written by L1 German speakers, some rhetorical styles in English writing may change as a consequence. Features of German academic writing that may transfer to English have been suggested by Clyne (1987a: 81), who has found that German-educated scholars are less likely than their English-educated counterparts to lead the reader through the text in an introductory section, develop the first section from the title and begin their paragraphs with a topic sentence. He also shows that German academic rhetoric is more likely to have digressions, asymmetry and statistics and quotations which are not embedded in the text (Clyne 1987b). Another study by Mauranen (1993), who compares academic writing in Finnish with academic writing in English, is relevant in the German context since she found that the Finnish strategies resemble the German tradition of academic writing. Mauranen (1993: 256) suggests that this type of writing favours a more implicit rhetorical strategy as, compared to academic writing in English, there is less metadiscourse and less emphasis on the main point. This style prefers end-weight strategies in argumentation, starting from a distance and proceeding towards the main point. More recent work by Fandrych and Graeffen (2002) find that German authors prefer different types of text comments than those commonly found in English. They suggest that German authors express

the immanent order of the text as a sort of ongoing process, thereby giving an account of their own mental planning of the text structure. The reader is concerned with what will happen to him [sic!] when reading the text. Thus, German ordinary academic language makes more lexical devices available for this purpose than English does. English authors, on the other hand, seem to prefer to imagine the text as a spatial object. They talk about their text as an already finished product and give an overview of its structure. Deictic expressions are used as 'signposts' of text

architecture—as if the author had once again gone through the core text, putting up signposts wherever s/he felt this was necessary (Fandrych and Graeffen 2002: 34–35).

The results of these studies imply that differences between German and English discursive strategies are a result of culturally different views of politeness. In German, the reader is expected to carry much of the processing load; thus, German writers imagine that their readers may be insulted by too much metadiscourse that could be considered patronising and condescending (cf. Mauranen 1993: 254). Furthermore, Fandrych and Graefen (2002: 36) find that in German too much metadiscourse is regarded as a hindrance rather than a help for text processing.

These differences in German academic discursive strategies may be transferred to English in texts written by L1 German speakers. Building on Halliday's (1978) notion of language as social semiotic, the adoption of German rhetorical styles through English texts can be seen as an ideological move, or deliberate resistance to Anglo-American dominance in academic publishing. Connor (1996: 16) speculates that as people become more sensitive to various societal-cultural intellectual traditions and ways of thought, they become more accepting of variation in rhetorical patterns. If this is indeed the case, it is likely to result in an increase in acceptance of L2 norms in academic texts. In order to speed up this development, Mauranen (2003) argues that Anglo-American standards should no longer be the reference point of a truly international discourse community and that it is time to start developing different standards in this communicative practice. A failure to follow this advice may result in a barrier to the exchange of scholarship between cultures. Therefore, 'it is up to academics from English and non-English educational backgrounds to learn to understand and respect one another's discourse patterns' (Clyne 1987a: 82). As a result, German academic style may gain increasing acceptance in English, and every writer's L1 will be valued as an important resource for writing while the sociocultural tradition behind it will also be respected.

5. Pedagogical implications: Teaching ELF at the university

Considering the broad use of ELF in Europe and the sense of ownership that many of these European users seem to have over the language, an

approach to university English-language teaching is needed that fosters students' skills in negotiating between students' local and global demands for the language. Likewise, this approach needs to take into account that teaching languages, and in particular dominant languages, is more than simply the teaching of grammar, vocabulary and even functions, but also embraces such social concerns as providing access to institutional power through the teaching of dominant genres and the possible negative consequences of cultural transfer. Nevertheless, when considering whether to teach new norms of English, educators must keep in mind that the teaching of L2 rhetorical styles or genres has been criticised on the one hand as a 'hypodermic' approach (Pennycook 2001: 104), when it is assumed that teaching powerful forms will transfer power, and on the other as overly simplistic in assuming that new voices can arise uncontested to challenge the existing norms of power. Therefore, issues of language and power must first be raised, and before speakers or writers are in a position to legitimate their own voices, a process of 'critical language awareness' (Fairclough 1992) appears to be necessary. In order to do this, Norton (2000: 16) suggests that instructors provide students with 'an understanding of the way rules of use are socially and historically constructed to support the interests of a dominant group within a given society.' In a similar vein, Fairclough (1992: 54) argues that students' linguistic practice 'should be informed by estimates of the possibilities, risks and costs of going against dominant judgment of appropriate usage.' Teaching in this way entails linking any alternative discourse practice to new interests and goals, ideally opening up a space in which learners can choose to either follow globalised norms or to appropriate these towards their own cultural ends. This practice grants students access to the global community in English and also allows for diversity and difference in language use.

While such issues of power and access may not seem wholly relevant in the case of FUB students, we would suggest that for *any* learner or outside group the legitimization of standard L2 usage is a problematic process, as it involves appropriating the words that others have populated for their own uses and which they see as their own property (cf. Bakhtin 1981: 293-294). Similarly, Hornberger and López (1998), Norton (2000) and Luke (1996: 310) point out that social power is not an add-on to linguistic mastery, despite the myths and misrecognition. This situation is surely exacerbated when it is not the standard L2 that is being

appropriated, but a novel form adapted by the outsider or outside group to fit their sociocultural needs and desires.

A crucial factor in shifting the standards of English and allowing for other voices and ways of expression in the language involves moving away from teaching languages as purely national constructs. Decke-Cornill (2002: 14) criticises German universities for adhering to the Herderian notion that one language is representative of one nation, so that study programmes persistently remain 'embedded in the philological realm of British and American studies, both culturally and linguistically.' This study lends support to Decke-Cornill's critique inasmuch as it shows that at the FUB, while the majority of students orient themselves to an L1 regional variety of English, a large number are consciously embracing a lingua franca variety. Moreover, many students expressed an interest in learning about other English-speaking cultures and other varieties of English beyond those of the US and the UK, and nearly all of them noted their needs for the language in global contexts. Therefore, their English education should not continue in a national tradition, nor should near-nativeness remain the goal of their language training, but instead their courses should be designed to prepare them for communication with all speakers of the language while potentially using the emergent varieties of ELF to express their identities as New Europeans.

At a basic level, a move away from a nationalist approach to English teaching entails the increasing study of contexts outside the US and the UK where English is used. As English is often used in lingua franca situations, students need to be exposed to a wide range of accents in order to increase their ability to perceive L2 varieties. As Jenkins (2000) suggests, the emphasis in teaching oral skills should be placed on communication, reception and accommodation. This means that speakers must adjust to one another in order to understand each other. In lingua franca communication, this flexibility is just as important as, if not more than, the mastering of prescribed forms. Courses in English should therefore place more emphasis on the ability to communicate using the medium of English rather than on the teaching of a particular form.

At a deeper level, a move away from teaching nationalist models of English requires that language teachers place emphasis on expertise in language and not 'native-speaker' norms (cf. Brutt-Griffler and Samimy 2001; Rampton 1990). Prodromou (2003), for example, has found that

successful L2 English speakers speak the language differently than L1 speakers, but this does not necessarily imply that their use is in any way deficient. In fact, L2 users of English often have advantageous linguistic skills that L1 users do not (cf. Medgyes 1994; Seidlhofer 1999). For example, speakers of ELF can, by definition, mediate between global and local languages and cultures at the linguistic level, an ability which should surely enhance their capability to negotiate on wider intercultural issues. These speakers should therefore provide alternative models to which students can orient themselves, while corpus studies investigating successful communication in lingua franca contexts—such as those being undertaken by Durham (2003), Jenkins (2000), Mauranen (2003), and Seidlhofer (2001a)—will certainly provide further insight into possible models of L2 English at the socio-rhetorical level. Placing emphasis on expertise would also entail a significant change in existing courses towards a wider goal of intercultural communication through the medium of ELF. While formal language development will certainly remain a central goal of education, in the age of globalisation and Europeanisation, ELF communication cannot be successful without intercultural understanding and mediation. English language education should therefore

promote a dialogue that brings together people from different national cultures and religious backgrounds. [...] It must enable them to examine their own societies and traditions critically. It should prepare them to regard themselves as human before all other identifications. It should enable them to understand what it is like to be someone different from themselves (Robertson 2003: 264-65).

Such an approach stresses the understanding and mediation of cultural differences, an approach based on the concept that English-language teaching is inherently ideological, not neutral, as it is commonly characterised.

Corbett (2003) outlines a pedagogical approach that involves teaching not only about cultures where the English language is used but about negotiating between these cultures. An intercultural approach ensures that students are 'able to view different cultures from a perspective of informed understanding' (Corbett 2003: 2). Ideally, English speakers with intercultural skills can both critically reflect on and value each culture that they have contact with, including their own. As a result, they are in a position to serve as mediators between groups

that use different languages and language varieties. In view of this, an important component of teaching intercultural competence is promoting pragmatic awareness of potential difficulties in cross-cultural interactions as well as providing students with strategies to negotiate these differences successfully (cf. Davies 2004). These include developing ways of seeking clarification, establishing rapport, and minimising cultural differences (McKay 2002: 127). As many FUB students indicate that they use English for the purpose of cross-cultural communication, language educators and students must seek ways to accommodate diversity without necessarily adopting the pragmatic rules of another culture.

The pedagogical practices mentioned so far focus primarily on oral communication in English. However, FUB students indicate that the frequent use of English in Europe—whether academically or professionally—requires them to be equally proficient in written English. In fact, the sociolinguistic profile reveals that 70% of students write academically or professionally in English once a week, while 51% write letters, emails, or other informal texts in English. Thus university writing instruction should also address such tasks. This could be attempted by employing a genre-awareness approach, in which students are taught to relate the common goals and features of texts in context to the lexicogrammatical resources used to achieve these. But while it is important to teach writing with an identifiable social purpose, simply fostering genre awareness may not be enough to hone students' critical skills in English. Leppänen (2003: 54) warns that 'the conventions and norms of academic writing in English can delimit the possibilities writers have to express their personal selves and cultural, gendered, and ethnic identities in writing.' Consequently, balance should be sought between imposing a rigid model for imitation and allowing for the identities students wish to present when writing in English. With this in mind, Harwood and Hadley (2003: 357) propose ways in which teachers can ensure that students have access to the standard forms of the language that are linked to prestige while simultaneously encouraging them to appropriate the language for their own ends. Similarly, Bartlett and Erling (2006) provide an analysis of how phases of ideational, interpersonal and textual features of discourse reflect different worldviews and legitimate culturally distinct forms of 'symbolic capital' in intercultural discourse.

6. Conclusion: Legitimation and New Europe

The approach to ELF taken in this paper arises from Erling's initial finding that students at the FUB did not display negative attitudes to English and its dominant role as a global lingua franca. Even those students who were not explicitly pro-US or UK viewed competence in English not just as a necessity but as something of value to them, even as an integral part of their everyday lives and of their modern identity. In this respect we have suggested that, even while these students frequently claim that their nonnative idiom reflects a neutral stance, it is possible to see this neutrality itself as an ideological statement. This comes out in two forms: presenting, on the one hand, an image as international 'peacemakers', using a non-culturally restricted variety of English 'in a world of internationalization and globalization' (student quote above); and, on the other hand, through the emergence of a sociopolitical identity as New Europeans where '[i]f you have a native-like accent you might be mistaken for somebody you aren't' (student quote above).

With respect to the questions of legitimacy raised by both Bakhtin (1981) and Bourdieu (1991), the crucial factor here is that, for these identities, legitimacy is not judged against native-speaker norms. The problem often facing speakers of 'non-standard' varieties is largely attributable to the lack of symbolic capital they command. This results from a mismatch between (1) their way of being, or *habitus*, which is influenced by the local culture and its history of symbolic capital and exchange, (2) the second language through which they must attempt to instantiate this embodied 'symbolic capital', and (3) the particular 'linguistic marketplace' in which speakers are situated. In this case, New Europe represents a new marketplace, an 'imagined community' of Europe's new professionals, with new sources of symbolic capital and new means of realising them. ELF speakers can thus cash in on the symbolic capital of being New Europeans as opposed to 'foreigners.' Legitimation comes from within this imagined community of like-minded internationals in professional or informal situations where there is no reason to fear being exposed as nonnative speakers. New fields of practice produce new symbolic capital and relations which do not demand L1 varieties of English.

At a basic level, this New Europeanism is realised through the positive acceptance of non-standard forms on a basis of intelligibility and, to some degree, international commonality. At a higher level, there is evidence from academic writing in particular that a new code is actively being styled. For example, as more German academics write in English, German academic style may gain increasing importance as a discourse style in English. Such hybrids are what Bartlett (2004) has called third-space genres, where the cultural norms of one group are being piggy-backed on the language of another. Such written genres clearly carry ideological implications, and more work needs to be done on the emergence of hybrid styles and interpretations of them. This would require an analysis of different levels of lexicogrammatical and discursive strategies in ELF communication and relating ways of speaking to ways of being. Such work is not simply a sociolinguistic exercise of academic interest, but a part of the process of the forming of a stabilised variety of ELF. With students working as ethnographers and also as instigators of their own and others' usage, they consciously further and deepen the ideological work of ELF that is already underway in their everyday practice.

References

- Alexander, Richard. 1999. "Caught in a Global English Trap, or Liberated by a Lingua Franca? Unravelling Some Aims, Claims and Dilemmas of the English Teaching Profession." *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language: Native and Non-native Perspectives*. Ed. Claus Gnutzmann. Tübingen: Stauffenburg. 23-40.
- Ammon, Ulrich. Ed. 2001. *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science: Effects on Other Languages and Language Communities*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Axelsson, Margareta Westergren and Angela Hahn. 2001. "The Use of the Progressive in Swedish and German Advanced Learner English: A Corpus-based Study." *ICAME Journal* 25: 5-30.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Bamgbose, Ayo. 1982. "Standard Nigerian English: Issues of Identification." *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Ed. Braj Kachru. Oxford: Pergamon. 99-111.
- Bartlett, Tom. 2004. "Genres of the Third Space: The Communities Strike Back." *Language and Intercultural Communication* 4, 3: 134-158.
- Bartlett, Tom and Elizabeth J. Erling. 2006. Factors in the Successful Evolution of Appropriately Non-Standard Ways of Speaking. Paper given at the 33rd International Systemic Functional Congress. Catholic University of São Paulo, Brazil, 10-14 July.
- Berns, Margie. 1995. "English in the European Union." *English Today* 11: 3-11.
- Bologna Declaration: Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. 1999. 19 June.
<http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna_declaration.pdf>.
[accessed 25 March 2006]
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Brutt-Griffler, Janina and Keiko Samimy. 2001. "Transcending the Nativeness Paradigm." *World Englishes* 20, 1: 99-106.
- Clyne, Michael. 1987a. "Discourse Structures and Discourse Wxpectations: Implications for Anglo-German Academic Communication in English." *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes*. Ed. Larry Smith. London: Prentice Hall. 73-84.
- Clyne, Michael. 1987b. "Cultural Differences in the Organization of Academic Texts." *Journal of Pragmatics* 11: 211-247.
- Connor, Ulla. 1996. *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-cultural Aspects of Second-language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, John. 2003. *An Intercultural Approach to English Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Crystal, David. 1995. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, Catherine Evans. 2004. "Developing Awareness of Crosscultural Pragmatics: The Case of American/German Sociable Interaction." *Multilingua* 23: 207-231.
- Decke-Cornill, Helene. 2002. "'We Would Have to Invent the Language We are Supposed to Teach': The Issue of English as *Lingua Franca* in Language Education in Germany." *Language, Culture and*

- Curriculum*. 15: 1-16. [Available at <www.erzwiss.uni-hamburg.de/personal/Decke-cornill/lingua_franca.pdf>]
- Durham, Mercedes. 2003. "Language Choice on a Swiss Mailing List." *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication* 9: 1. [Available at <<http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol9/issue1/durham.html>>]
- Erling, Elizabeth J. 2004. *Globalization, English and the German University Classroom: A Sociolinguistic Profile of Students of English at the Freie Universität Berlin*. Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, University of Edinburgh.
- Erling, Elizabeth J. 2005. "Who is the 'Global English' Speaker? A Profile of Students of English at the Freie Universität Berlin." *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom*. Eds Claus Gnutzmann and Frauke Intemann. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 215-230.
- Erling, Elizabeth J. 2006. "'Man spricht Deutsch!': Attempts to Curtail the Use of English in Germany and the Views of Students of English at the Freie Universität Berlin. Paper given at the Symposium 'English in the European Media.' *Sociolinguistics Symposium 16*. University of Limerick, July 2006.
- Erling, Elizabeth J. and Suzanne K. Hilgendorf. 2006. "Language Policies in the Context of German Higher Education." *Language Policy*. Online version:<http://www.springerlink.com/content/6w6p65587763p675/>
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
- Fandrych, Christian and Gabriele Graeffen. 2002. "Text Commenting Devices in German and English Academic Articles." *Multilingua* 21: 17-43.
- Ferguson, Charles. A. 1975. "National Sociolinguistic Profile Formulas." *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964*. Ed. William Bright. The Hague: Mouton. 309-324.
- "The Freie Universität Today." 2006. *Freie Universität Berlin*. <http://www.fu-berlin.de/en/info/fub/vorstellung/fu_heute.html>. [accessed 19 July 2006]
- Grau, Maike. 2005. "English as a Global Language: What Do Future Teachers Have to Say?" *The Globalisation of English and the*

- English Language Classroom*. Eds Claus Gnutzmann and Frauke Intemann. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 261-274
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Arnold.
- Harwood, Nigel and Gregory Hadley. 2003. "Demystifying Institutional Practices: Critical Pragmatism and the Teaching of Academic Writing." *English for Specific Purposes* 23: 355-377.
- Hornberger, Nancy and Luis Enrique López. 1998. "Policy, Possibility and Paradox: Indigenous Multiculturalism and Education in Peru and Bolivia." *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*. Eds Jasone Cenoz and Fred Genesee. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 206-242.
- "Initiative for Excellence Competition." 2006. *Freie Universität Berlin*. <<http://www.fu-berlin.de/en/info/exzellenzini/index.html>>. [accessed 19 July 2006]
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 1998. "Which Pronunciation Norms and Models for English as an International Language?" *ELT Journal* 52, 2: 119-126.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2000. *The Phonology of English as an International Language: New Models, New Norms, New Goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2002. "A Sociolinguistically Based, Empirically Researched Pronunciation Syllabus for English as an International Language." *Applied Linguistics* 23 (1): 83-103.
- Jibril, Munzali. 1982. "Nigerian English: An Introduction." *New Englishes*. Ed. J.B. Pride. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 73-84.
- Kachru, Braj. 1982. "South Asian English." *English as a World Language*. Eds Richard W. Bailey and Manfred Görlach. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 353-383.
- Kachru, Braj. 1985. Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle. *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Eds Randolph Quirk and Henry G. Widdowson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 11-30.
- Kachru, Braj and Cecil L. Nelson. 1996. "World Englishes." *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Eds Sandra Lee McKay and Nancy H. Hornberger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 71-102.
- Kaufman, Leonard and Peter J. Rousseeuw. 1990. *Finding Groups in Data: An Introduction to Cluster Analysis*. New York: Wiley.

- Leppänen, Sirpa. 2003. "Universalistic Handbook Discourse and the Local needs of Writers." *Text* 23 (1): 53-87.
- Luke, Allan. 1996. "Genres of Power? Literacy and Education and Production of Capital." *Literacy in Society*. Eds Ruqaiya Hasan and Geoff Williams. Harlow: Longman. 308-338.
- Mackiewicz, Wolfgang. 2005. "The Introduction of the Bologna Structure as an Opportunity for Innovation." Paper given at *The Implementation of the Common European Framework of Reference at Higher Education Level*. Freie Universität Berlin, December 2005.
- Mauranen, Anna. 1993. *Cultural Difference in Academic Rhetoric*. Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang.
- Mauranen, Anna. 2003. "The Corpus of English as Lingua Franca in Academic Settings." *TESOL Quarterly* 37: 513-527.
- McArthur, Tom. 2002. *The Oxford Guide to World English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, Sandra Lee. 2002. *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Medgyes, Peter. 1994. *The Non-native Teacher*. London: Macmillan.
- Mei, Lee-Wong Song. 2001. "The Polemics of Singlish: An Examination of the Culture, Identity and Function of English in Singapore." *English Today* 17: 39-45.
- Meierkord, Christiane and Karlfried Knapp. 2002. "Approaching Lingua Franca Communication." *Lingua Franca Communication*. Eds Karlfried Knapp and Christiane Meierkord. Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang. 9-28.
- Melchers, Gunnel and Philip Shaw. 2003. *World Englishes*. London: Arnold.
- Modiano, Marko. 2000. "Rethinking ELT." *English Today*. 16, 2: 28-34.
- Modiano, Marko. 2001. "Ideology and the ELT Practitioner." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11: 159-173.
- Norton, Bonny. 2000. *Identity and Language Learning*. London: Pearson.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 2001. *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ & London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Preisler, Bent. 1999. "Functions and Forms of English in a European EFL Country." *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. Eds Tony Bex and Richard Watts. London: Routledge. 239-267.
- Preshous, Andrew. 2001. "Where You Going Ah? An Account of the Origin and Development of Malaysian English." *English Today* 17: 46-53.
- Prodromou, Luke. 2003. "In Search of the Successful User of English." *Modern English Teacher* 12: 5-14.
- Rampton, M. B. H. 1990. "Displacing the 'Native Speaker': Expertise, Affiliation, and Inheritance." *ELT Journal* 44: 97-101.
- "A Rich Tradition." 2006. *Freie Universität Berlin*. <<http://www.fu-berlin.de/en/info/fub/vorstellung/traditionsreich.html>>. [accessed 18 March 2006]
- Robertson, Robbie. 2003. *The Three Waves of Globalization*. London: Zed Books.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 1999. "Double Standards: Teacher Education in the Expanding Circles." *World Englishes* 18: 233-245.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001a. "Closing a Conceptual Gap: The Case for a Description of English as a Lingua Franca." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11: 133-158.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001b. "Habeas Corpus and Divide et Impera: 'Global English' and Applied Linguistics." *Unity and Diversity in Language Use: Selected Papers from the Annual Meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics held at the University of Reading, September 2001*. Eds Kristyan Spelman Miller and Paul Thompson. London: British Association of Applied Linguistics, in association with Continuum. 198-217.
- Smith, Larry. 1976. "English as an International Auxiliary Language." *Readings in English as an International Language*. Ed. Larry Smith. Oxford: Pergamon. 1-6.
- Swan, Michael and Bernard Smith. 1987. *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter and Jean Hannah. 1985. *International English: A Guide to Varieties of Standard English*. London: Arnold.

40 *Erling and Bartlett*

Wright, Sue. 2000. *Community and Communication: The Role of Language in Nation State Building and European Integration*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.